IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	SESEU/ED
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA	RECEIVED CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

Tony Tyrone Wilson, #192143,	2005 MAR 17 ₱ 3÷ 10
Petitioner, v.)) Civil Action No. 3:09-303-SB-JRM)
Warden, Broad River Correctional Institution,	ORDER)
Respondent.))

This matter is before the Court on the *pro se* Petitioner's request for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Pursuant to Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On February 25, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("R&R"), analyzing the issues and recommending that this case be dismissed as a second or successive § 2254 petition. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Petitioner that he may file specific, written objections to the R&R within ten days after being served with a copy; however, the Petitioner's mail containing the R&R was returned on March 5, 2009, marked "return to sender" and "released."

As of this date, the Petitioner has neither filed objections to the R&R nor updated the Court with a current mailing address. Based on these failures, it appears that the Petitioner no longer wishes to pursue this action. Moreover, absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because

A CANADA

no objections have been filed, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review of any portion of the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Petitioner's § 2254 petition is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Sol Blatt, Jr.

Senior United States District Judge

March 17, 2009 Charleston, South Carolina

